

Russell M Davis
Pacific Justice Institute
29 Lakewood Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127
Telephone: 415-310-6575
Email: loanhound@sbcglobal.net

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

DAVID CHIU, State Bar #189542
City Attorney
LAUREN E. WOOD, State Bar #280096
ADAM M. SHAPIRO, State Bar #267429
Deputy City Attorneys
Fox Plaza
1390 Market Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102-5408
Telephone: (415) 554-4261
E-Mail: lauren.wood@sfcityatty.org
adam.shapiro@sfcityatty.org

Attorneys for Defendant
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SELINA KEENE, MELODY FOUNTILA,
MARK MCCLURE,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CITY and COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;
LONDON BREED, Mayor of San Francisco
in her official capacity; CAROL ISEN,
Human Resources Director, City and County
of San Francisco, in her official capacity;
DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

Case No. 22-cv-01587-JSW

**INITIAL JOINT CASE
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
STATEMENT**

Date: April 28, 2023
Time: 11:00 a.m.
Dept: Courtroom 5 – 2nd Floor
1301 Clay St.
Oakland, CA 94621
Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S. White
Trial Date: None set.

The parties to the above-entitled action jointly submit this Joint Case Management
Statement and Proposed Order pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-9 and the Standing Order for All

Judges of the Northern District of California.

1. Jurisdiction and Service

The basis for the court's subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims and defendant's counterclaims, whether any issues exist regarding personal jurisdiction or venue, whether any parties remain to be served, and, if any parties remain to be served, a proposed deadline for service.

This Court has original jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, and 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(3). This Court has jurisdiction over the related state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a). Plaintiffs' claims for declaratory and injunctive relief are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because all defendants reside in this District and because a substantial part of the events complained of herein occurred in this District and Division. There are no issues regarding personal jurisdiction or venue. Plaintiffs have served the City and County of San Francisco. The Plaintiffs have dismissed the individual defendants from the lawsuit.

2. Facts

A brief chronology of the facts and a statement of the principal factual issues in dispute.

PLAINTIFF'S POSITION

Plaintiffs are a group of 3 former employees of the City and County of San Francisco ("CCSF" or "San Francisco" or "City") who were denied reasonable accommodations from the City's mandate that all workers receive the COVID-19 vaccine. Each sought an accommodation from CCSF based on either their religious beliefs or a medical condition (or both) requesting an exemption from the vaccine mandate.

Plaintiffs contend that the City's denial of their religious and/or medical exemption requests violated Title VII and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). Both Title VII and FEHA protections require employers to provide religious or medical accommodations to employees seeking to be excused from job requirements that conflict with the employee's religious beliefs or medical conditions. An employer may deny such a request if it would create an undue burden for the employer. Title VII and FEHA have different undue burden requirements, though the Title

1 VII undue burden requirement is currently under review by the U.S. Supreme Court. FEHA
2 requires employers to establish a higher degree of undue burden in order to successfully invoke this
3 defense, whereas currently the Title VII counterpart has a lower degree of burden. FEHA also has
4 specific requirements that an employer engage in and explore reasonable accommodations with the
5 employee in order to invoke the undue burden defense.

6 Plaintiffs contend that the City failed to engage in negotiations and explore reasonable
7 alternatives to vaccination and that there were reasonable alternatives, particularly testing, that
8 did not create an undue burden. Among others, some key facts supporting this position are
9 summarized as follows.

10 First, the City granted a mere 11/125 medical requests (8.8%) while only granting 8/943
11 religious requests (0.84%). Even those employees working entirely remote were denied reasonable
12 accommodations. Also, those who had previously received a granted accommodation had
13 their accommodations retroactively revoked when the City learned that certain departments had
14 granted some exemptions. By contrast, neighboring Marin County California had a 95.65%
15 approval rate for requested accommodations. When the neighboring county could grant
16 95.65% of requests without an undue burden, the City will be hard pressed to prove that its less
than 1% approval rate was justified.

17 Second, the City developed a system to ensure that all (or nearly all) accommodation
18 requests were denied and retroactively revoked previously granted accommodation request.
19 When some requests were still being granted the City changed the forms and did re-training to
20 ensure that requests were not approved. The City also ditched genuine good faith negotiations and
21 changed what should have been an interactive process into a box checking game. They trained
22 evaluators to look for ways to deny the accommodation requests, rather than assist with granting
23 them if possible. They also trained evaluators to harass those requesting accommodations by
24 teaching them to ask manipulative questions undermining the sincerity of the requesting person's
25 religious beliefs.

26 Third, by August 2021 the CDC had made multiple statements and had collaborated with the
27 Wisconsin Department of Health Services to publish a large-scale joint study on this issue.
28 This study showed vaccinated individuals had high higher viral loads and were just as likely to

1 transmit infection as unvaccinated individuals. Furthermore, vaccinated individuals posed a greater
2 contagion risk due to the increased likelihood of asymptomatic infection. By August 2021, this
3 high-quality data supported by the CDC established that vaccination did not reduce transmission
4 and, therefore, testing represented the only legitimate means for reducing transmission. This is
5 highly problematic for the City because the City fired all 135 Plaintiffs after this data was
6 published. Regular testing not only represented a reasonable accommodation, but by the time
7 Plaintiffs were fired it also represented the only meaningful way to reduce viral transmission.
8 Consequently, the City will be hard pressed to prove that it had a non-discriminatory motive.

9 It is also a well-known tenant of immunology that natural immunity is always better than
10 vaccine induced immunity, which has been confirmed by clinical research of Covid-19. The City
11 refused to recognize natural immunity. In any event, the City could not possibly have had any non-
12 discriminatory reason for refusing to grant public facing employees the option of regular testing
13 for always represented the best and only option meaningful option for reducing infection
14 exposure and transmission in situations where contact could not be avoided.

15 The foregoing is list is not a complete summary of the key facts and is intended only as
16 a brief introduction to some of the Plaintiff's key factual points.

17 **Section 1983 claims**

18 Plaintiffs will be seeking leave to amend their complaint to bring claims for violation of their
19 state and federal constitutional rights pertaining to the free exercise of religion. The vaccine mandate
20 is not a generally applicable policy because it has a mechanism for individualized exemptions. The
21 policy therefore must survive strict scrutiny, which it does not satisfy. Testing represented a
22 narrower, less restrictive, and more effective means of satisfying the touted goal of reducing virus
23 transmission as compared with vaccination. The policy does not satisfy constitutional
24 requirements and therefore represents an actionable violation of Plaintiffs religious free exercise
25 rights. Plaintiffs will also amending to add a breach of contract claim.

DEFENDANT'S POSITION

The City and County of San Francisco (the "City" or "CCSF") requires all of its employees in every department or agency to be fully vaccinated against COVID-19 as a condition of employment pursuant to its COVID-19 Vaccination Policy.

CCSF has a duty to provide a safe and healthy workplace for its employees. The COVID-19 Vaccination Policy was based on the findings of the federal Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the California Department of Health (CDPH), and the San Francisco County Health Officer that COVID-19 continued to pose a risk to individuals who were unvaccinated and that safety measures remained necessary to protect the public at large. Thus, CCSF concluded that the Vaccination Policy would help keep its employees and constituents safe from the spread of COVID-19; minimize work and staffing disruptions from absences and quarantines due to COVID-19; and reduce the administrative burden of having to provide weekly testing for those who are unvaccinated. As a result, CCSF made the decision to require all employees to receive the COVID-19 vaccination unless approved for a medical or religious exemption. Under the COVID-19 Vaccination Policy, employees were required to report their vaccination status and to be fully vaccinated (defined as having received both doses of the Pfizer or Moderna vaccine or a single dose of the Johnson & Johnson vaccine). The COVID-19 Vaccination Policy informed employees of their rights to request an exemption on the basis of a sincerely held religious belief that conflicted with the vaccination requirement, or on the basis of a medical condition that prevented the employee from being vaccinated.

Plaintiffs objected to and refused to comply with CCSF's COVID-19 Vaccination Policy, thereby risking and endangering the health and safety of their colleagues and members of the public with whom many of them must interact pursuant to their job duties as public entity employees. CCSF conducted an individualized assessment of each Plaintiff's request for an exemption from the COVID-19 Vaccination Policy, and determined that most of the Plaintiffs were not eligible for the exemption(s) sought, and/or that granting the Plaintiffs' requested exemption(s) would be an undue burden on CCSF.

1 Eventually, with respect to the Plaintiffs in this matter, after sustained non-compliance
 2 with CCSF's COVID-19 Vaccination Policy, the Plaintiffs were separated from CCSF's
 3 employment. Plaintiffs now challenge CCSF's determination of their ineligibility for a religious
 4 and/or medical exemption from the COVID-19 Vaccination Policy and/or CCSF's determination
 5 that granting an accommodation to the policy would be an undue burden.

6 CCSF denies Plaintiffs' claims. The allegations in the Complaint are inaccurate,
 7 incomplete, or otherwise fail to support a valid a claim.

8 **3. Legal Issues**

9 *A brief statement, without extended legal argument, of the disputed points of law, including*
 10 *reference to specific statutes and decisions.*

11 **Plaintiff's Position:**

12 (1) Did the City violate Plaintiffs' rights under Title VII and FEHA by denying Plaintiffs
 13 religious and/or medical accommodation requests and terminating them because Plaintiffs failed to
 14 comply with the City's mandatory Covid-19 vaccination policy,

15 (2) under Title VII, did the City engage in good faith accommodation discussions and/or
 16 does the City have a legitimate undue burden defense;

17 (3) Under FEHA, did the City engage in required negotiations concerning accommodation
 18 options for purposes of invoking the undue burden defense,

19 (4) Under FEHA, assuming the City engaged in adequate negotiations, does the City
 20 meet the requirements for satisfying an undue burden defense,

21 (5) Under the U.S. and California Constitutions, does the City's vaccination policy violate
 22 Plaintiffs rights regarding the free exercise of their religion.

23 **Defendant's Position:**

24 (1) Whether CCSF properly concluded that it could not reasonably accommodate
 25 Plaintiffs' allegedly sincerely-held religious beliefs, practices, or observances without undue
 26 hardship on its operations;

27 (2) Whether facts presented by Plaintiffs in their requests for accommodation provided an
 28 objective basis for questioning either the religious nature or the sincerity of a particular belief,

1 practice, or observance of Plaintiffs, and thus CCSF was justified in requesting additional
2 supporting information;

3 (3) Whether Plaintiffs failed to show sincere or bona fide religious conflict with CCSF's
4 COVID-19 vaccine;

5 (4) Whether CCSF's COVID-19 Vaccination Policy violated Plaintiffs' right to free
6 exercise of their religion.

7 (5) Whether Plaintiffs failed to show that they have a severe life-threatening allergic
8 reaction or immediate systemic allergic reaction to all of the FDA authorized COVID-19 vaccines
9 or a component of each of them.

10 (6) Whether a Plaintiff failed to show that their physical condition or medical
11 circumstances rendered immunization unsafe.

12 **4. Motions**

13 *All prior and pending motions, their current status, and any anticipated motions.*

14 **Plaintiff's Position**

15 There are no pending motions. The Plaintiffs are waiting for the appellate decision in this
16 matter, which may obviate this cmc statement. Plaintiffs intend to move the court to amend the
17 complaint and anticipate filing a motion for summary judgment. At this time, the Parties do not
18 anticipate needing to file any discovery motions unless unanticipated disputes regarding
19 discovery arise.

20 CCSF has filed a motion to consolidate this Action with six pending and related federal cases
21 challenging the CCSF's COVID-19 Vaccination Policy on the same legal grounds and alleging
22 substantially the same or similar facts. Recently, the Court consolidated two of these six cases –
23 *Guardado, et al. v. City & County of San Francisco*, No. 4:22-cv-04319-JSW (“*Guardado Class*
24 *Action*”) and *Shaheed, et al. v. City & County of San Francisco*, No. 4:22-cv-06013-JSW.
25 Consolidation of all vaccine-related litigation against CCSF will facilitate broader case
26 management and coordination issues presented by the actions and avoid inconsistent rulings.

27 Plaintiffs are willing to discuss what aspects of this case may be consolidated with the cases
28 involving similar types of religious and medical exemption claims, but do not believe that

discovery and trial scheduling can be fully coordinated due to the unique need in this case to conduct discovery and trials for multiple cases.

Defendant's Position

Defendants London Breed and Carol Isen (Individual Defendants) filed a motion to dismiss on May 19, 2022 (Dkt. No. 15), and Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction on May 23, 2022 (Dkt. No. 19). On September 23, 2022, the Court issued an order granting the motion to dismiss and denying the motion for a preliminary injunction. (Dkt. No. 31.) Plaintiffs filed a petition for rehearing as to the order denying the motion for preliminary injunction (Dkt No. 32), which the Court denied (Dkt. No. 33.) Plaintiffs appealed the order denying a preliminary injunction, and that appeal remains pending before the Ninth Circuit.

CCSF will file a motion to consolidate this Action with six pending and related federal cases challenging the City's COVID-19 Vaccination Policy on the same legal grounds and alleging substantially the same or similar facts. Recently, the Court consolidated two of these six cases – *Guardado, et al. v. City & County of San Francisco*, No. 4:22-cv-04319-JSW (“Guardado Class Action”); and *Shaheed, et al. v. City & County of San Francisco*, No. 4:22-cv-06013-JSW. Consolidation of all vaccine-related litigation will facilitate broader case management and coordination issues presented by the actions and avoid inconsistent rulings.

The City may also file a motion for summary judgment and/or adjudication at the appropriate time.

5. Amendment of Pleadings

The extent to which parties, claims, or defenses are expected to be added or dismissed and a proposed deadline for amending the pleadings.

CCSF does not anticipate any amendment of its pleadings.

Plaintiffs anticipate that some amendment of the pleadings will occur regarding to additional causes of action.

6. Evidence Preservation

A brief report certifying that the parties have reviewed the Guidelines Relating to the Discovery of Electronically Stored Information (“ESI Guidelines”) and confirming that the parties have met and conferred pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) regarding reasonable and proportionate steps

1 *taken to preserve evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action. See ESI*
 2 *Guidelines 2.01 and 2.02, and Checklist for ESI Meet and Confer.*

3
 4 The Parties have not met and conferred but agree that an ESI order may need to be entered
 5 in the case. At this time, CCSF has placed litigation holds in all of the relevant departments, but
 6 is still in the process of reconciling the electronic infrastructure of the numerous departments
 7 in which Plaintiffs worked so as to be able to agree to an order in this regard. The Parties agree
 8 that an ESI order will likely need to be entered after the initial exchange of information.

9 **7. Disclosures**

10 *Whether there has been full and timely compliance with the initial disclosure requirements of*
 11 *Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 and a description of the disclosures made. For ADA and employment cases,*
 12 *see General Order Nos. 56 and 71.*

13 **Plaintiffs' Position:** There are only three (3) Plaintiffs in this case. Initial disclosures
 14 should be governed by Rule 26. Initial disclosures should be made within 45 days of the CMC
 15 order in this matter.

16 **CCSF's Position:** The parties previously agreed to stay this matter pending the resolution
 17 of Plaintiffs' appeal of the Court's order denying Plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction.
 18 In the event that the City's motion to consolidate is granted, then the City believes that initial
 19 disclosures should be due at the same time as the initial discovery proceeding in the other
 20 consolidated matters. In the event that the motion to consolidate is denied, then given the parties
 21 prior agreement, initial disclosures should be stayed pending resolution of the appeal.

22 **8. Discovery**

23 *Discovery taken to date, if any, the scope of anticipated discovery, any proposed limitations or*
 24 *modifications of the discovery rules, a brief report on whether the parties have considered*
 25 *entering into a stipulated e-discovery order, a proposed discovery plan pursuant to Fed. R. Civ.*
 26 *P. 26(f), and any identified discovery disputes.*

27 **Plaintiff's Position:**

28 There has been no discovery exchanged to date. The scope of anticipated discovery is

1 voluminous. It is anticipated that some written discovery including interrogatories, document
 2 requests, and requests for admission will be necessary. It is also anticipated that an extensive
 3 number of depositions will be necessary after written discovery is complete, but the number and
 4 identity of such individuals cannot be determined until information is complete, but the number and
 5 identity of such individuals cannot be determined until information is exchanged. Plaintiffs request
 6 that an additional case management conference be set for approximately 6 months from the
 7 currently scheduled CMC to set further discovery deadlines after completion initial discovery.

8 **Defendant's Position:**

9 There has been no discovery to date. CCSF contends that discovery should be coordinated
 10 with the Related Cases following an additional case management conference if the Court grants
 11 CCSF's motion to consolidate. Further, Defendant contends that discovery of documents and
 12 deposition testimony should be conducted in the proposal articulated in the *Guardado* Initial Joint
 13 Case Management Conference Statement, Section 8. In the event that the cases are not
 14 consolidated, then discovery should remain stayed pending the resolution of Plaintiffs' appeal of
 15 the order denying Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction.

16 **9. Class Actions**

17 *If a class action, a proposal for how and when the class will be certified.*

18 This is not a Class Action.

19 **10. Related Cases**

20 *Any related cases or proceedings pending before another judge of this court, or before another
 court or administrative body.*

21 There are at least 106 charges filed by former CCSF employees with the California
 22 Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the United States Equal Employment
 23 Opportunity Commission. There are also numerous cases filed with CCSF administrative bodies
 24 concerning individual putative class members who are members of various unions, each of which
 25 have collectively-bargained grievance procedures that must be undertaken as a matter of due
 26 process.

27 In terms of litigation, there are six related cases in N.D. Cal. that counsel is aware of at
 28 this time which are as follows:

- *Guardado v. CCSF*, No. 3:22-cv-04319-JSW
- *Shaheed, et al. v. CCSF*, No. 4:22-cv-06013-JSW
- *Gozum v. CCSF*, No. 4:22-cv-03975-JSW
- *Debrunner, et al. v. CCSF, et al.*, No. 3:22-cv-07455-TSH
- *Cook v. CCSF*, No. 4:22-cv-07645-HSG
- *Sanders v. San Francisco Public Library, et al.*, No. 3:23-cv-00211-JD

There are at least six vaccine-exemption cases in San Francisco Superior Court of which counsel for CCSF is aware:

- *Qwist, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-593669 [this complaint has not been served]
- *United SF Freedom Alliance, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-595642
- *Kricken, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-22-600135
- *Sanchez v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-22-601015
- *Gomwalk, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-22-600975
- *Cattaneo, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-22-601361

11. Relief

All relief sought through complaint or counterclaim, including the amount of any damages sought and a description of the bases on which damages are calculated. In addition, any party from whom damages are sought must describe the bases on which it contends damages should be calculated if liability is established.

Plaintiffs' Position

The Plaintiffs are seeking the following relief:

1. Declare that CCSF violated Title VII, and California state law for its failure to provide a reasonable accommodation for Plaintiffs clearly articulated religious beliefs and medical needs when numerous no-cost options were available;
2. Declare that CCSF violated Title VII, and California state law by failing to engage in the interactive process in response to Plaintiffs requests for accommodations to the City's vaccine mandate and, instead, preemptively denied those requests based on pretextual reasons;

3. Declare that CCSF's disparate treatment of religious employees—in interrogating those seeking religious accommodations in a bad faith attempt to undermine their beliefs rather than determine reasonable accommodations—constitutes religious discrimination in violation of Title VII and California state law;
4. Declare that CCSF violated Title VII, the ADA, and California state law by retaliating against Plaintiffs for engaging in protected activity through seeking religious and medical accommodations;
5. Declare that CCSF violated the ADA by treating each of the Plaintiffs as being perpetually infected by a threatening virus, thus regarding them as disabled and discriminating against them without justification;
6. Declare that CCSF violated Plaintiffs' constitutional and statutory privacy rights by disclosing their private medical information to non-authorized personnel and/or to the general public.
7. Declare that CCSF violated Plaintiffs' constitutional rights to free exercise of religion by imposing the vaccine mandate upon them without satisfying the requisite constitutional standards.
8. Award Plaintiffs damages, including back pay, front pay, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, punitive damages, and compensatory damages and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of CCSF's unlawful employment practices;
9. Award Plaintiffs damages necessary to make them whole by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described above, including but not limited to emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, loss of enjoyment of life, humiliation, and loss of civil rights, in an amount to be determined at trial;
10. Award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and
11. Grant any other relief that the Court deems just and proper;

Defendants' Position

CCSF denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any damages or relief.

12. Settlement and ADR

Prospects for settlement, ADR efforts to date, and a specific ADR plan for the case, including which ADR process option the parties have selected and a proposed deadline, or if the parties do not agree, each party's preferred option and timing, in compliance with ADR L.R. 3-5. In addition, the parties should include a description of key discovery or motions necessary to position the parties to negotiate a resolution.

Plaintiffs are willing to participate in a mediation.

CCSF believes that consideration of ADR is premature at this stage, and will need to be revisited after CCSF's motion to consolidate is resolved and initial discovery has been completed.

13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes

Whether all parties will consent to have a magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings including trial and entry of judgment. ☐ YES ☒ NO

14. Other References

Whether the case is suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

No other references are needed at this time. At this time, the parties agree that this case is not suitable for arbitration, a special master, nor the judicial panel on multidistrict litigation.

15. Narrowing of Issues

Issues that can be narrowed by agreement or by motion, suggestions to expedite the presentation of evidence at trial (e.g., through summaries or stipulated facts), and any request to bifurcate issues, claims, or defenses.

Defendant's Position: CCSF will move to bifurcate liability and damages in discovery and at trial.

Plaintiffs Position: To be determined.

16. Expedited Trial Procedure

Whether this is the type of case that can be handled under the Expedited Trial Procedure of General Order 64, Attachment A. If all parties agree, they shall instead of this Statement, file an executed Agreement for Expedited Trial and a Joint Expedited Case Management Statement, in accordance with General Order No. 64, Attachments B and D.

No expedited procedures are needed at this time.

1 **17. Scheduling**

2
3 *Proposed dates for completion of initial ADR session, designation of experts, discovery cutoff, hearing of dispositive motions, pretrial conference and trial.*

4 **Plaintiffs' position:** Plaintiffs request that the court set an additional case management
5 conference for purposes of setting the relevant scheduling orders after initial disclosures are
6 complete.

7 **Defendant's Position:** Following the completion of the initial phase of discovery and after initial
8 depositions are completed, the Parties should meet and confer to determine if a second phase of
9 discovery is necessary and whether ADR or dispositive motions will assist in the resolution of the
10 action.

11 **18. Trial**

12 *Whether the case will be tried to a jury or to the court and the expected length of the trial.*

13 **Defendant:** In light of CCSF's forthcoming motion to consolidate all federal related
14 actions, CCSF believes setting a trial date is premature. Notwithstanding, CCSF anticipates that a
15 multi-plaintiff action encompassing just the three plaintiffs will take 9-12 days.

16 **Plaintiff:** Plaintiff agrees that setting a trial date is premature.

17 **19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons**

18 *Whether each party has filed the "Certification of Interested Entities or Persons" required by*
19 *Civil Local Rule 3-15. In addition, each party must restate in the case management statement the*
20 *contents of its certification by identifying any persons, firms, partnerships, corporations*
21 *(including parent corporations) or other entities known by the party to have either: (i) a financial*
interest in the subject matter in controversy or in a party to the proceeding; or (ii) any other kind
of interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

22 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-15, the Plaintiffs certify that as of this date, there is no conflict of
23 interest (other than the named parties) to report.

24 CCSF is a public entity and Civil Local Rule 3-15 does not apply.

25 **20. Professional Conduct**

26 *Whether all attorneys of record for the parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional*
27 *Conduct for the Northern District of California.*

28 All attorneys of record for the parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional

1 Conduct for the Northern District of California.

2 **21. Such Other Matters as May Facilitate the Just, Speedy, and Inexpensive**
3 **Disposition of This Matter**

4 *Such other matters as may facilitate the just, speedy and inexpensive disposition of this matter.*

5 The Parties are presently unaware of any other matters that may facilitate the just, speedy
6 and inexpensive disposition of this matter, aside from issues already discussed above by the
7 parties.

8
9 Dated: April 26, 2023

PACIFIC JUSTICE INSTITUTE

10 */s/ Russell Davis*

11 _____
RUSSELL DAVIS
12 Attorney for Plaintiffs

13
14 Dated: April 26, 2023

15 DAVID CHIU
City Attorney
16 ADAM M. SHAPIRO
LAUREN E. WOOD
17 Deputy City Attorneys

18 By: */s/ Adam M. Shapiro*

19 ADAM M. SHAPIRO

20 Attorneys for Defendant
21 City and County of San Francisco

ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO N.D. CAL. LOCAL RULE 5-1

Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other Signatories. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/Adam Shapiro

ADAM SHAPIRO